

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook ('655) in view of Garczynski ('880) and Iwagaki ('783).

Regarding claim 1, Cook ('655) discloses having an image printing system (kiosk, **See Figure 1**) with a main body (the self-service film processing system, **See Figure 1, Element 100; Col. 3, Line 60-62**) and a backyard printing part that is connected to the main body via a line (the printer is located in proximity to the system, such as a cashiers counter, in order to process the prints, **See Col. 8, Line 40-47**). The main body includes an image data inputting unit for inputting the image data (processing negative film, a scanner, storage media, and a digital camera, **See Fig. 1, Device 118; Col. 6, Line 28-Col. 7, Line 7**), a request inputting unit (customer input device, **See Figure 1, Element 116**) for inputting requests for an image to be outputted (lets the customers to input data or interact with the system, **See Col. 6, Line 6-8**), a display unit for displaying an image (monitor, **See Figure 1, Element 102**), an output content indicating data preparation unit (the touch screen monitor, **See Figure 1, Element 102**) to prepare the data content to be outputted (the touch screen has the ability to display the images and allow the customer to choose the specific digital images outputted in several different

forms, allows the image to be edited, **See Fig. 1; Col. 4, Line 15-24**, and also output the images back onto the storage media, **See Fig. 1, Col. 9, Line 11-19**). It also contains an output method choice unit (user selecting how and where to output the images, **See Col. 7, Line 30-34**) for selecting either instantaneous printing using the instantaneous printing unit (local printer, **See Figure 1, Element 134a**, to print the images instantaneously at the kiosk, **See Col. 8, Line 41-44**) or backyard printing (printed near the cashier's register, **See Col. 8, Line 45-46**). The main body also includes a private information inputting unit (payment system such as a card reader, **See Figure 1, Element 112a**) to input information of the customer (user inputs credit card to pay for the services of the printing system, **See Col. 5, Line 9-14**), and a receipt note issuing unit (receipt printer, **See Figure 1, Element 112d**) that is capable of outputting a receipt note (the printing system outputs a receipt containing a bar code, **See Col. 5, Line 19-40**). The backyard printing section includes the collation sheet printing unit (customer receives the prints that were ordered from the clerk, **See Col. 5, Line 29-40**).

While Cook ('655) does disclose inputting information into the printing system, he does not disclose having a user input private information of the customer and getting a receipt that includes the customer identity information inputted.

Garczynski ('880) discloses having a user input private information and receiving a receipt of the information that includes customer identity information (user inputs private information, such as personally selected data on a card, **See Col. 2, Line 20-22**,

such that one it is entered into the system, the user is issued a receipt that includes a unique transaction code for identification purposes, **See Col. 1, Line 46-53**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to include inputting private information and receiving a receipt of the information, such as the one disclosed within Garczynski ('880), and incorporate it into the image printing system of Cook ('655) because the receipt allows a user to verify that the information inputted was accepted correctly without any modifications required.

Cook ('655) further does not disclose having the outputted collation sheet include the customer identity information.

Iwagaki ('783) discloses outputting the collation sheet (**See Figure 11**), which includes the customer identify information inputted (a customer code, **See Figure 11, Element 33**, which was inputted earlier, **See Col. 17, Line 66-Col. 18, Line 10**, is included within the index print sheet when outputted, **See Col. 19, Line 12-17**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to include the customer identity information, such as the one disclosed within Iwagaki ('783), and incorporate into the image printing system of Cook ('655) because it verifies the customer identification (See Abstract of Iwagaki ('783)) as well as prevents someone who is not the identified customer from retrieving the printed data.

Regarding claim 2, Cook ('655) discloses using a scanner to input various forms of images directly at the kiosk to produce the digital image (**See Figure 1, Element 118b; Col. 6, Line 39-42**).

Regarding claim 3, Cook ('655) discloses using other forms for inputting images, such as an undeveloped film scanner, signal input for devices such as a digital camera, a storage media reader such as a CD, DVD, flash drive, and a floppy drive, as well as accessing images using the Internet from a communications network (**See Figure 1, Element 118; Col. 6, Line 61-Col. 7, Line 2**).

Regarding claim 4, Cook ('655) discloses the main body (the self-service film processing system, **See Figure 1, Element 100; Col. 3, Line 60-62**) and the backyard print are located in the same shop (they are located in the proximity to the film processing system, **See Col. 8, 44-47**).

Regarding claim 5, Cook ('655) discloses the main body (the self-service film processing system, **See Figure 1, Element 100; Col. 3, Line 60-62**) and the backyard print are connected through a network (the output device, **See Figure 1, Element 124**, includes a communications network, **See Figure 1, Element 124a; Col. 7, Line 31-35**).

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook ('655) in view of Garczynski ('880) and Iwagaki ('783) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Nardoizzi ('837) and Vance ('874).

Regarding claim 20, Cook ('655) discloses an image printing system (self-service film processing system with a touch screen monitor, **See Fig. 1; Col. 4, Line 15-24**) with a printer located in the kiosk (**See Fig. 1, Element 124c; Col. 8, Line 43-44**).

Cook ('655) fails to show an overview image of the kiosk for the exact location of everything describe and also fails to point out if the monitor has the ability to be adjusted in height and tilt angle.

Nardozzi ('837) provides a figure of a kiosk that shows a monitor located at the upper side of the main body and displays information such as images and the like on the touch screen to help the customer complete the order with the various input devices located directly to the right of it (**See Fig. 1 and Fig. 5A-5G**).

Vance ('874) describes having a monitor that adjusts to the height of the user's eyes, either automatically by use of a camera, or manually (**See Fig. 3; Col. 2, Line 34-42**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of the invention by applicant to have the kiosk constructed similarly to the one suggested by Nardozzi ('837) and being more user-friendly such as having the monitor being located at the upper side of the main body and also adjustable such as the one suggested by Vance ('874) that provide users with different heights a better and more helpful viewing experience.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook ('655) in view of Garczynski ('880) and Iwagaki ('783) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Nardozzi ('837), Vance ('874), and Minamishin ('468).

Regarding claim 23, Cook ('655) discloses an image printing system (a self-service film processing system with a touch screen monitor, **See Fig. 1; Col. 4, Line 15-**

24), with inlet ports connections, and storage media such as a CD or DVD-ROM which have an open/close cover to insert the media (**See Fig.1, Element 118; Col. 6, Line 45-Col. 7, Line 2**) so the user can input the images on the touch screen monitor, which displays image and character information to help choose anyone to edit (**See Col. 4, Line 3-7**), and finally output it in several different forms, one being a printer located in the kiosk (**See Fig.1, Element 124c; Col. 8, Line 43-44**).

Cook ('655) fails to show an overview image of the kiosk for the exact location of everything describe, also does not disclose an outlet port with an automatic open/close cover to retrieve the images, and fails to point out if the monitor has the ability to be adjusted in height and tilt angle.

Nardozzi ('837) provides a figure of a kiosk that shows a monitor located at the upper side of the main body and displays information such as images and the like on the touch screen to help the customer complete the order with various input devices located directly to the right of the display monitor (**See Fig. 1 and Fig. 5A-5G**).

Vance ('874) describes having a monitor that adjusts to the height of the user's eyes, either automatically by use of a camera, or manually (**See Fig. 3; Col. 2, Line 34-42**).

Minamishin ('468) discloses an ATM having a gate port to disperse money whenever a user wants to retrieve a certain amount (**See Fig. 1; Col. 5, Line 11-16**), and also has an operating mechanism for closing the gate port after the money is removed (**See Fig. 1; Col. 6, Line 8-14**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of the invention by applicant to have the kiosk constructed similarly to what was described by Nardozzi ('837) with a monitor that is more user friendly and adjustable to the person's height such as the one described by Vance ('874), and added an automatic open/close cover for the printed images such as the one described by Minimishin ('468) to prevent anyone stealing the printed images at the kiosk while someone is still there.

Claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook ('655) in view of Garczynski ('880) and Iwagaki ('783) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Morba ('033).

Regarding claim 24/1, Cook ('655) discloses a kiosk being able to input an image from various sources, such as a digital camera (**See Fig. 1, Element 118; Col. 6, Line 45-49**), print it out onto the printer located within the kiosk (**See Fig. 1, Element 124c; Col. 8, Line 43-44**). Cook ('655) discloses cropping an image (**See Col. 7, Line 20-25**), but does not describe a way to align that image proportionally within the frame. It well known within the art that whenever an image is being cropped, the user has a box to select a region to keep, then the remaining image can be realigned to the user's specification.

Cook ('655) fails to disclose a printer within the kiosk being able to adjust the edited image in proportion to the pre-cut paper before printing.

Morba ('033) describes a printing system that lets the user choose the desired dimensions of the image into any given size by using a cutting mechanism (**See Fig. 1,**

Element 25; Col. 3, Line 48-49), and also uses a Micro Light Valve Array digital printer to scan a light containing the image data from the pre-cut sheets (**See Col. 3, Line 57-67**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to have the kiosk of Cook ('655) attach a cutting mechanism like the apparatus described by Morba ('033) in order to allow a user the opportunity to customize the size of any image by specifying the particular dimensions within the kiosk before aligning and printing out the image.

Regarding claim 25, Cook ('655) discloses a software program within the kiosk so the user is able to adjust, or edit, the image before it is outputted to the printer (**See Col. 7, Line 19-22**).

Cook ('655) does not disclose adjusting the image includes scaling, translocating, or rotating.

The examiner takes **OFFICIAL NOTICE** that editing an image includes scaling, translocating, or rotating. The reason is because an image might need to be scaled down in order to fit within the frame, located to another place to fit better within the frame, or have the image rotated so it can be either a horizontal or vertical printout. Thus by incorporating these adjustments into the image printing system, it assists the user to enhance the image prior to outputting it.

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook ('655) in view of Garczynski ('880), Iwagaki ('783) and Morba ('033) as applied to claim 24, and further in view of Otsuki ('096).

Regarding claim 26, Cook ('655) discloses cropping an image (**See Col. 7, Line 20-25**), but does not describe a way to align that image proportionally within the frame. It well known within the art that whenever an image is being cropped, the user has a box to select a region to keep, then the remaining image can be realigned to the user's specification.

Cook ('655) does not disclose detecting the transporting state of the pre-cut seal before printing and adjusting the printing where a deviation of the position is calculated for the printing position.

Morba ('033) discloses once the user selects the desired dimensions for the image (**See Col. 3, Line 48-49**), the sheet is first cut into the requested size prior to printing on it (**See Col. 4, Line 8-10**) so the printing position is able to be calculated, or scanned, in order to form an image on the sheet (**See Col. 3, Line 57-67**).

Otsuki ('096) discloses a deviation adjustment procedure (**See Col. 10, Line 10-35**) in order to determine if it corresponds to the stored value in the PROM within the printer to achieve the preferred corrected position (**See Col. 10, Line 55-67**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to have the kiosk of Cook ('655) include a detecting unit like the apparatus described by Morba ('033) and a standard deviation on Otsuki ('096) because it eliminates the user from having to cut the borderlines around the image once

it is outputted from the kiosk and also adjust the image in order to include all the information whenever it is outputted.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook ('655) in view of Garczynski ('880), Iwagaki ('783), Morba ('033) and Otsuki ('096) as applied to claim 26, and further in view of Wright ('478).

Regarding claim 27, Cook ('655) does not disclose a detection mark that is provided on the backside of the pre-cut seal.

Wright ('478) discloses a detection mark (**chop mark, See Figure 1, Element 18**) that is provided on the back in order to have the images cut (**See Col. 3, Line 24-37**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to have the kiosk of Cook ('655) include a detection mark on the back of the pre-cut seal, such as the one described by Wright ('478) because the kiosk is then able to detect the correct position the user requested from the detection mark on the back of the image, which eliminates any calculations errors for the image position.

Claims 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook ('655) in view of Garczynski ('880) and Iwagaki ('783) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Minamishin ('468).

Regarding claims 35-36, Cook ('655) discloses a kiosk that has the ability to print out digital images at the machine itself from various inlet port connections and storage media, such as a CD or DVD-ROM and also has an open/close cover to insert the media so the user can input the images, edit, and output them (**See Col. 6, Line 45-Col. 7, Line 2**).

Cook ('655) fails to describe an outlet port with an automatic open/close cover to retrieve the printed images whenever the user wants them printed instantaneously.

Minamishin ('468) discloses an ATM having a gate port to disperse money whenever a user wants to retrieve a certain amount (**See Fig. 1; Col. 5, Line 11-16**), and also has an operating mechanism for closing the gate port after the money is removed (**See Fig. 1; Col. 6, Line 8-14**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of the invention by applicant to have applied an automatic open/close cover such as the one suggested by Minamishin ('468) added to the kiosk of Cook ('655) if a payment method was done at the kiosk and the instantaneous printing was chosen, the printed images cannot be removed until task is completed to prevent anyone from removing them without the customer's knowledge.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 20, 23-27 and 35-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. Thus, the prior art of Garczynski and Iwagaki is used in combination with Cook and is able to meet the limitations of the claims as disclosed within the rejection above.

Based on these facts as well as having the applicant's arguments been fully considered and persuasive, **THIS ACTION IS MADE NON-FINAL.**

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vincent Rudolph whose telephone number is (571) 272-8243. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8 A.M. - 4:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 2625

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Vincent Rudolph
Examiner
Art Unit 2625

/Vincent Rudolph/
Acting Examiner of Art Unit 2625

/Mark K Zimmerman/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625